**Annex 3 Outline for programme for Regional Workshop on Joint Programming for Central, East and Southern Africa, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 13-14 March 2014**

***Burundi, Chad, Rwanda, Comoros, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, South-Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Zimbabwe***

*Version 31 January 2014*

**Venue**

**Elilly International Hotel**

Kazanchis, Kirkos Subcity 17/18, PO Box 29228 Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Tel: +251 115 587 777 / 70

Fax: +251 115 585 200

E mail: [info@elillyhotel.com](mailto:info@elillyhotel.com)

Internet: www.elillyhotel.com

**Day 1 Thursday, 13 March 2014**

**09.00 – 09.30 Welcome by organisers/facilitators**   
*(All TBC) Director EEAS; Director DEVCO; Deputy Director General for International Cooperation, MFA the Netherlands; Director Geographic Directorate, MFA Belgium; EU HoD Ethiopia*

**09.30 – 11.00 Overview Joint Programming (background, concept, state of play, way forward, experience with first workshop in Guatemala)**   
*Presentation and facilitation by EEAS and DEVCO followed by discussion*

**11.00 – 11.30 Coffee/tea break**

**11.30 – 13.30 Lessons learnt from advanced cases in the region and other regions***Facilitation by MS HoC; presentations of country cases and experiences by EU/MS HoCs of three countries (each for every region) and Joint Programming consultant*

**13.30 – 15.00 Lunch**

**15.00 – 17.30 Break-out sessions on pre-identified issues (World Café approach, see annex)***.   
Facilitation TBD*

**17.30 – 19.30 Cocktail/buffet**   
*Opening EU HoD Ethiopia and Belgian and Dutch Ambassadors*

**Day 2 Friday, 14 March 2014**

**09.00 – 10.30 Break-out sessions continued**

**10.30 – 11.00 Coffee/tea break**

**11.00 – 13.00 Plenary presentation of break out groups and discussion on solutions/actions**

**13.00 – 14.30 Lunch**

**14.30 – 16.30 Break-out sessions on: *What do we take home?****Facilitation TBD; presentation of proposals on the way forward for each country , followed by peer review of the wider group*

**16.30 – 17.00 Coffee/tea break**

**17.00 – 18.00 Conclusions and next steps***Adoption of workshop conclusions and country proposals*

**18.00 – 18.30 Closing remarks***(all TBC) Director EEAS; Director DEVCO; (Deputy) Director General for International Cooperation, MFA the Netherlands; Director Geographic Directorate, MFA Belgiu, EU HoD Ethiopia*

**Background documentation (to be sent one week before workshop)**

* Heads of Mission reports
* Country roadmaps
* Joint Programming (draft) documents

**Break-out sessions day (1) 15.00 – 17.30 and day (2) 9.00 – 10.00**

**World café methodology**

The world café discussion is a creative brainstorming session which allows substantial discussion on a variety of subjects in a relative short space of time. [Number] tables will be set up, each with a host. At each table one issue will be discussed. Participants at the workshop will be asked to choose a discussion, with not less than [number] and not more than [number] people per table. The host will introduce the discussion at the beginning of the first round. Afterwards, each participant will take 2-3 minutes to write down key words on individual cards. Then each participant will present his/her cards and table discussion will follow. There will be a number of rounds of discussion, where after each round people will move to another topic. In-between the host collects the cards and clusters them around related items (on a white board). The host will briefly present the outcome of the previous group to the next groups and the procedure described above will be repeated. So, each time next group will build on the previous one. Finally, the host or a reporter will debrief the plenary on the debates of each topic.

**Preliminary list of topics for discussion (to be revised following inputs from participants)**

**1 What is the added value of joint programming?**

*The added value of joint programming is laid down in the Council Conclusions on the EU common position for the Busan High Level Forum. It comes down to increased EU impact and development effectiveness. Still, some argue that we need a stronger narrative and message on the added value. An example is the case of fragile states, where it is sometimes thought that the New Deal processes replaces rather than complement joint programming. Another issue is how joint programming adds value where well-functioning donor coordination mechanisms already exist, where national interests/visibility are at stake, where short-term investment (resources, time) is substantial, where the number of EU donors is very limited, where the role of Multilateral donors is dominant, or where EU donors are gradually phasing out. So, in this session we aim to identify the elements of the added value of joint programming in more detail.*

**2 How to improve the flow of guidance and information within/between capitals; between capitals and field offices; and at the field level itself (EU Delegations and Embassies)?**

*Both at the EU and Member States levels there has been an investment in communication through the provision of training, consultancy, regular meetings, etc. Still, there is feeling that practice action-oriented guidance and information are not always getting through, leading to misunderstandings about objectives, concepts, approaches and expectations. So, in this session proposals should be discussed to strengthen the various levels of commitment to the underlying process, to better communicate and to consider what the responsibilities are of the various actors.*

**3 How can we ensure a (gradual) implementation of synchronisation?**

*Synchronisation with the timeline of the partner country cycle is a means to ensure that the donors participating in a joint programming exercise will agree on one moment in time to launch a fully-fledged joint programming exercise. It helps to ensure partner country ownership and donor alignment. This requires flexibility in donors’ planning horizons and procedures. In practice we face a variety of challenges, which are in some cases (in capitals as well as in the field) matched by (creative) solutions, including gradual approaches towards synchronisation (e.g. interim joint programming plans, programming reviews, rolling plans, delinking national financial budgeting cycle from aid commitments, and legal/procedural reforms). So, in this session we look for better understanding of the issues around synchronisation and the practical consequences.*

**4 How to ensure an appropriate division of labour and inclusion of indicative allocations?**

*Division of labour and complementarity have been on the EU agenda for a long time, notably since the adoption by the Council of the EU Code of Conduct in 2007. As various studies have shown, only limited progress has been made. Joint programming is meant to provide the strategic framework in which choices on specialisation, sector choices and division of labour should be made. Because of the current economic and financial situation most (EU) donors are rationalising their involvement and cooperation programmes, which could be an enabling factor for division of labour. In addition, the recently submitted (draft) joint programming documents include encouraging proposals for division of labour. Technical questions like sector definitions have been raised as well as on how far donors can go with indicative allocations (timelines, level of transparency and commitments to the government). So, this session should address the question of whether the incentives (policies, procedure, attitudes) for increased division of labour (in-country and across countries) and sharing of indicative allocations are in place and which further issues should be addressed and how.*

**5 How can Joint Programming be used as instrument for an EU common results-based approach?**

*The Agenda for Change Council Conclusions of May 2012 called for the development of a ‘common results-based approach, including through the use of strengthened results-based frameworks at the country level’, to increase monitoring and evaluation. So far, some EU donors, including the EU itself, have developed or are in the process of developing their own institutional results frameworks. The common aspect has been debated in the EU results expert meetings, but only in an exploratory way. Joint programming could be an instrument to fulfil (part of) this commitment. Joint programming is in-country led and therefore potentially closely aligned to the partner countries’ results frameworks. Joint programming already provides the EU a local framework through joint analysis/response, division of labour and indicative allocation. In addition, the expected results are normally identified through programming processes. Inclusion of results would take joint programming one step further, but not overstep the line of bilateral implementation plans. So, this session should look into the potential of joint programming to contribute to the commitment of the common results-based approach of the EU.*

**6 How can Joint Programming foster joint implementation?**

*Joint Programming has a positive impact on complementarity, transparency and predictability of bilateral aid from EU and Member States. Beyond this, Joint Programming – through the Joint EU Response Strategies - could facilitate overall cooperation with the partner countries. Thus, EU Joint Response Strategies can be expected to catalyse the implementation of bilateral development cooperation as well as fostering joint implementation (at sector level) on the ground . In this way Joint Programming could serve as a coherent umbrella at the country level. This session will discuss how this integration could be put in practice.*